

---REMARKS---

Claims 19 and 27 have been canceled.

New claim 37 has been added.

Claim rejections 35 USC 102

Claims 19-26, 28-30, 32-33, and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as being anticipated by Cook (U.S. Pat. 5,234,100).

The Cook reference (U.S. Pat. 5,234,100) shows a pre-loaded, pre-fabricated, resiliently biased ball or roller bearings.

New Claim 37 recites, *"A conveyor type roller comprising a substantially hollow cylinder supported by a stationary and fixed shaft so as to be substantially non-deflecting in order to maintain an alignment of the sleeve-type bearing housings which are attached to the roller."*

This language distinguishes over Cook under Section 102 because Cook does not show sleeve-type bearings. Therefore, since Cook does not teach sleeve type bearings, the Applicant respectfully submits that Amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Cook and is in condition for allowance. See, e.g., MPEP 2131, *Verdegaal Bros. v Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Circ. 1987) ("A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference."); *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236 (Fed. Circ. 1989) (The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the...claim.") Therefore applicant submits that Claim 37 is allowable over the cited references and requests reconsideration and allowance.

Claims 20-26, 28-30, 32, 33 and 36 are dependent claims incorporating all the limitations of independent Claim 37. Withdrawal of the rejection of these claims under 35 USC 102 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections- 35 USC 112

Claim 30 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 30 was amended to recite, *"The apparatus of claim 37, further comprising using tapered bearings to allow the sleeve type bearing housings to absorb both radial and axial thrust loads."*

This recitation makes the claim more clear and understandable by distinctly identifying the sleeve type bearing housings.

Claim 31 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 31 was amended to recite, *"The apparatus of claim 37, further comprising centering each bearing housing within the roller by means of vane like radial ribs which act as pump impeller vanes so as to motivate the surrounding fluid in between the shaft and the contacting sleeve-type bearing housings to flow in the radial direction through ports for the purpose of bearing cooling or lubrication."*

This recitation makes the claim more clear and understandable by distinctly identifying the fluid surrounding the roller.

Conclusion

For all the reasons given above, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims now comply with Section 112 and that the claims now define over the prior art under Section 102. No new matter has been added by this amendment. Accordingly, Applicant submits that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which applicant respectfully requests.

Respectfully Submitted,



Gary J. Morris, Ph.D.
Agent for Assignee
Registration No. 56,689
West Virginia University Research Corp.
Interim Associate Director
Office of Technology Transfer
Chestnut Ridge Research Building
886 Chestnut Ridge Road 2nd Floor
PO Box 6216
Morgantown, WV 26506